REMARKS

This amendment is being filed in conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 30-40, 42-44, and 46-59 are pending, with claims 30, 40, 42, and 56 being independent. New claims 51-59 have been added. Claims 41 and 45 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

This response first addresses the Logan rejection, then addresses the Logan in view of Loehndorf rejection, and finally addresses Logan in view of Raciborski rejection.

Logan rejection

Claims 30-34, 36-37, 39-46, and 48-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Logan et al. (6,578,066). Applicants have amended independent claims 30, 40, and 42 to obviate the § 102(e) rejection.

As amended, claim 30 recites receiving/processing at a the primary communications system "a request to access the Internet," and "identifying, based on the processed request, a secondary communications system that is more optimally suited for providing Internet access to the client's system than the primary communications system." More specifically, claim 30 recites using "the secondary communications system as an access point to the Internet for subsequent data communications between the client system and the Internet, such that the subsequent data communications between the client and the Internet pass through the secondary communications system." Logan fails to disclose or suggest at least these limitations.

Logan has no regard for receiving/processing Internet access requests. Rather, Logan focuses on the replying to web page requests that presuppose pre-established Internet access. For instance, in seeking to respond to a web page request, Logan teaches automated selection among web servers based on various criteria. See Col. 3, lines 7-25.

The servers selected by Logan therefore respond to web page requests; they do respond to Internet access requests that necessarily precede such web page requests. In fact, Logan is remiss of any disclosure concerning Internet access requests, or selection of communications systems capable of handling such requests.

In rejecting the prior version of claim 30, the Office action references several specific portions of Logan. Relevant citations to Logan are addressed below to further explain Logan's failure to disclose a client system configured to direct subsequent Internet access requests through the secondary communications system, as required by claim 30.

Specifically, through citation to cols. 4-5, the Office action appears to relate the geographically diverse server of Logan to the claimed secondary communications system. However, Logan's geographically diverse servers are mere web servers, which act as the end-points for client-server communications and require the client to pre-establish access to the Internet. (See e.g., Figure 1, where client Z must first have access to the Internet in order to communicate with Sites A, B, or C). Thus, as the communication end-points, Logan's servers reply to web page requests, but do not allow "communications between the client and the Internet [to] pass through" them. Therefore, through its disclosure of geographically diverse servers and rerouting of web page requests thereto, Logan fails to provide any disclosure relevant to using "the secondary communications system as an access point to the Internet for subsequent data communications between the client system and the Internet, such that the subsequent data communications between the client and the Internet pass through the secondary communications system", as recited by claim 30.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended independent claim 30 and its respective dependent claims.

Similarly, independents claims 40 and 42 recite an arrangement in which the secondary communication system acts as an access point[s] to the Internet for subsequent data communications between the client system and the Internet. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claims 40 and 42 and their respective dependent claims for the reasons discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 30.

Logan in view of Loehndorf/Raciborski

Claims 35 and 47, which depend from amended independent claims 30 and 40, respectively, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Loehndorf. Similarly, claims 38 and 50, which depend from amended independent claims 30 and 40, respectively, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Raciborski. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections because neither Loehndorf nor Raciborski remedy the failure of Logan to describe or suggest "enabling configuration of the client system to direct subsequent Internet access requests from the client system and to use the secondary communications system as an access point to the Internet for subsequent data communications between the client system and the Internet, such that the subsequent data communications between the client and the Internet pass through the secondary communications system ," as recited by claim 30.

Enclosed is a check for $1460 for the Request for Continued Examination fee, excess claim fees, and the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/26/05

Kevin E. Greene
Reg. No. 46,031

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40285806.2.doc